

SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Stakeholder Meeting #2, January 28, 2008
District Headquarters, West Palm Beach, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Meeting Objectives:

- Receive information on SFWMD current conservation efforts and rules, regulations and limitations
- Receive a presentation on the development of Iteration #1 of the Plan
- Input ranking and comments by stakeholders of Iteration #1
- Continued development of input on Plan in preparation for Iteration #2

STAKEHOLDERS IN ATTENDANCE

Water Conservation Stakeholder	Alternate	Attendance Jan 28
Mark Hull Village of Golf, Manager		NO
Commissioner Kristin Jacobs Broward County Commission	Jennifer Jurado, Ph.D.	YES Alternate in attendance
Commissioner Tammy Hall Lee County Commission		YES
Charles Shinn, Assistant Director, Government & Community Affairs, Florida Farm Bureau		YES
Tom MacVicar, MacVicar, Federico & Lamb		YES
Dave Self, Florida Nursery Growers & Landscapers Association, President	Jim Spratt (FNGLA staff)	YES
Paul Mattausch, Director, Collier County Public Utilities	Roy Anderson	YES
Randy Brown, Director, City of Pompano Beach Utilities	Mr. Bevin Beaudet	YES
Mr. John Renfrow , Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Dept	Maribel Balbin	YES Alternate in attendance
John Stunson, City of Oakland Park, City Manager	Susan Smith	YES Alternate in attendance
Susan Watts , Bonita Bay Group	Dennis Church	YES Alternate in

		attendance
Andrew Lester , Regional President, Broward County, The Continental Group	Ron Capitena	NO
Jacqueline Weisblum, Everglades Team Leader, Audubon of Florida	Dr. Paul Gray, Audubon	YES
Peg McPherson, Vice President, The Everglades Foundation		YES
Eric Call, Asst. Director Palm Beach County Parks	Gary Monnett	YES
Joel Jackson, CGCS, Executive Director, Florida Golf Course Superintendents Association	Steve Pearson, CGCS	YES
Kevin Cavaoli , American Society of Landscape Architects, Florida Irrigation Society		YES
Bryan Fennell, General Manager II - Environmental, Water, Lab, Florida Power & Light	Matt Raffenberg	YES
Rick Hawkins, The Breakers		YES
Armando Rodriguez, Director of Environmental Affairs		YES
Anne Murray, P.G., County Hydrogeologist, Martin County Utilities		YES

WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Janice M. Fleischer, J.D., Facilitator, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone back. She asked all members of the stakeholder group to introduce themselves. She reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit A), the Meeting Guidelines and the Public Comment Guidelines.

All Reports of Proceedings with exhibits, Meeting Guidelines and Public Comment Guidelines can be found on the SFWMD website at:

https://my.sfwmd.gov/portal/page?_pageid=3034,20240111,3034_20194643&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL.

DEVELOPING THE FIRST ITERATION

Deena Reppen, SFWMD, Deputy Executive Director of Government and Public Affairs, gave a short overview of how the first iteration of the Water Conservation Program Plan was developed (First Iteration-Exhibit B). For consistency, the format is based on the South Florida Water Management District's Strategic Plan. The document is divided into three major areas: regulatory initiatives, voluntary and incentive-based initiatives, and education and marketing.

One of the changes made was in the area previously titled "enforcement". Drafting staff felt it was more appropriate to title this section "regulatory". Two sections which had been identified by the stakeholders at their first meeting, environment and finances, were eliminated as separate sections and incorporated as underlying core values of the plan with recommendations and concepts incorporated into all three initiatives as it was felt they related to and affected all three.

At the conclusion of the document development overview, Ms. Reppen introduced Tom Swihart of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) who delivered a presentation on three important programs having a strong impact on and strong relation to this long term Water Conservation Program. These programs are: Florida Green Lodging, Conserve Florida, and Drought Smart (Exhibit C). Mr. Swihart stated Florida citizens and governments must become pro-active in making their environment drought resistant.

Stakeholder comments following Mr. Swihart's presentation:

1. If we use the Water Conservation Initiative (WCI), Drought Smart and Conserve Florida, could we come up with a really good plan?
 - a. Conserve Florida really only for public water supply
2. Why isn't there a representative here from IFAS?
 - a. IFAS is working with the St. Johns WMD and Southwest FWMD; we need to be consistent with them, (terminology, facilities, etc.)
3. Green Lodging Program: what has the program been able to produce in water savings through operational changes?
 - a. Challenging to quantify water use savings in many of those sectors, but a keystone of the program is measuring water use.
 - b. Measurement is required in green lodging.
4. Slide #13, could we break that down in a more sensible way? Show more about how the fresh water is used.
 - a. Agriculture is the largest user of fresh water in Florida
 - b. Next is public water supply
 - c. Recreational irrigation
 - d. In comparison to other Water Management Districts, the SFWMD has increased water use the most over the years.
 - i. The population within the boundaries of the SFWMD has grown considerably and accounts for the increased water use.
5. Knowing water use stats would help us in developing this Plan.
6. Per capita consumption: do we have a statewide standard way to measure it?
 - a. USGS defines per capita for their purposes.
 - b. You need to include tourists as well as permanent residents. This is difficult to estimate due to variables.

Staff members of the SFWMD followed Mr. Swihart's presentation with overviews of the contents of the first iteration of the Program.

Chip Merriam-Regulatory

Deena Reppen- Education and Marketing

Mark Elsner- Voluntary

Regulatory Section of document: (Chip Merriam, Deputy Executive Director, Water Resources, presented this initiative)

Mr. Merriam presentation included the following information:

- Complicating factor is consumptive use
- Very difficult to determine per capita: tourism, cruise ships use and take water, etc.
- We are very good at getting water off the ground
- Our role has changed significantly; now we actually have to say “no” if requests for water cannot be mitigated
- Simple test:
 - Reasonable
 - Beneficial
 - No negative impact on existing legal users
- Numbers coming from the water supply plans
- Difficult to determine what each household needs in water
- As time passes, it becomes easier for the water management districts to account for all the water used
- Need to determine if there are water uses that you must account for if you are applying for a water use permit
- Permits are now being issued for longer than the original 5 year period; depends on what water user can demonstrate in stats on its water use

Member comments regarding the Regulatory Initiatives Section:

1. Look at the Environmental Resource Permitting (ERP) process; is there a way to make it regulatory?
 - a. Good idea, but local governments restrictions can be more stringent than District restrictions
 - b. We should consider incorporating the ERP process into this document as well
2. In Miami-Dade County, there will be a requirement for greater specifics from water users
 - a. Needs to be top-down rather than bottom-up
3. If currently using or instituting reclaimed water, can those proactive measures and water savings be considered with permitting process?
 - a. Trying to use an incentive process
4. Using water only one time no longer considered water conservation
5. What about considering the types of grass we use? Especially when a rural area becomes suburban or urban.
6. Of the percent of new development infrastructure, what percentage is providing dual water systems? (potable vs. non-potable)
7. City of Pompano is retrofitting in old neighborhoods; problem we are having is getting residents to hook up and move their irrigation lines and pay for it; we go to the property line, but then there can be a significant cost from the property line to owner's line
 - a. Some local governments are not issuing new construction permits if your well runs dry, you must then go on public supply
8. The norm is looking at allowing residents to water grass only 2x a week, regardless of drought conditions (pro active)
 - a. 40-50% of consumption on lawns is too inefficient; too much demand
9. What opportunity will we have to hammer out details?

Voluntary Section of the document: (Mark Elsner, Director, Water Supply Implementation Division, presented this Initiative)

Mr. Elsner's presentation included the following information:

- All to implement water savings technology
- 5 components

- Savings
- Quantify the savings and costs (cost benefit)
- Offer incentives (funding, permitting, etc.)
- Implementation and recognition programs
- Research to continue to learn and improve
- Continue looking at diversifying water sources
- We need to do more follow up on implementation
- Retrofitting: we need to look at larger sectors: region-wide
- We need to recognize those groups/entities that are good water users
- Funding of research in mostly through IFAS, we need to continue to support research
- Efficiency is a key element

Member comments regarding the Voluntary and Incentive-based Initiatives:

1. Financial incentive program needs to be looked at again to see if it can be made simpler; this can really benefit the effort
2. Landscape irrigation: create more irrigation labs; existing savings can not be recorded
3. Concept of new development being incentivised; many items are really not more expensive for developers (toilets, etc.) and so we should make it mandatory
 - a. We may need to make all water use measurement methods be consistent/comparable
4. Local government programs can always use additional funds for incentives
5. How do you get around funding constraints (some state programs are being eliminated, for example)?
6. How do we demonstrate/suggest savings within the home?
 - a. It may be a difficult concept to get homeowners to change what they want.

Education and Marketing Initiatives: (Deena Reppen presented this section of the document)

Ms. Reppen's presentation included the following information:

- Tried to engage all audiences
 - School-based education
 - General public information
 - Professional development
 - Social marketing
 - Volunteer activities
- Want to encourage consistency throughout the state; look at what is working in other WMDs and local programs and use what is successful
- Encourage existing partnerships
 - Use recognition programs

Member comments:

1. The District has an outstanding public education program and other initiatives so we should look to the District as the role model.

BREAK

At this point in the meeting, members took a short break.

INPUT RANKING PROCEDURE

The Facilitator introduced the procedure used to determine the level of consensus of Iteration #1 of the Plan. Each section of the Plan would be "ranked" by the stakeholders using the following rules:

- Consensus level is shown as follows:
 - 5: WHOLEHEARTED SUPPORT
 - 4: SUPPORT

- 3: NEUTRAL BUT WILL SUPPORT FULLY TO OUTSIDE WORLD
- 2: YOU STILL HAVE QUESTIONS YOU NEED TO ASK
- 1: YOU STILL HAVE REAL CONCERNS
- If an item has no rankings below a “3”, consensus is achieved (although further commentary may be taken.
- In the event anyone ranks an item a “1” or a “2”, discussion will follow to answer questions or concerns of those members and attempt to reach consensus if possible.

INPUT RANKING OF ITERATION #1

The Facilitator then led the stakeholders through the process of ranking each section of the document (See Exhibit B)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Following the ranking process, Public comment was announced. No one commented.

LUNCH

The meeting was adjourned for lunch.

DOCUMENT DISCUSSION/COMMENTARY

Following lunch the Facilitator led the stakeholders in an interactive dialogue and commentary on each section of the document. SFWMD staff was in attendance to answer questions if necessary. The results of all rankings as well as the record of the discussion and commentary are contained on Exhibit B.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

The stakeholders asked for the following presentations for next meeting:

1. What tools does the District have available to us/them?
2. University of Florida/Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS)
3. Rule Development Presentation
 - a. What can and can't be done

Members were reminded to fill in their Evaluations and the meeting was adjourned.
